PLATO. *Timaeus*, Trans. by Rev. R. G. Bury. The Loeb Classical Library, London, William Heinemann; Cambridge (Mass.), Harvard University Press, 1929.

PLATO. *Philebus and Epinomis*, Trans. by A. E. Taylor. London and New York, Thomas Nelson, 1956.

PORTMANN, A. (1956). *Zoologie und das Neue Bild des Menschen*. Basel, Friedrich Reinhardt A.G.

SARTON, G. (1952). *A History of Science*. Cambridg (Mass.), Harvard University Press.

REPLY

E. F. EDINGER

It is difficult to reply to Mrs. Jacoby's critique in a coherent way since her objections to my hypothesis seem to rest on a temperamental bias. This is illustrated by her remark that "It is difficult to see why this, or indeed, any diagram should be applicable to the drama in the Book of Job". One may personally dislike the schematic, categorizing tendency of abstract thought, but without it we would have no theory of the structure of the psyche and no hypothesis to guide us in the interpretation of dreams. Indeed, our theory of the structure and dynamics of the adult psyche has been quite fully developed by Jung. It is only on the subject of psychic development throughout all stages of life that we lack a well-ordered, coherent theory. Neumann, however, has made major contributions to the construction of such a theory. My own paper is another attempt in that direction.

One of my concerns was the desire to understand why it is that most psychiatrists, and Freudians in particular, are unable to perceive the archetypes and the objective psyche; why Freud saw the id where Jung saw the collective unconscious and the self. My suggested explanation for this is the theory of ego-self identity. As long as the manifestations of the self or objective psyche occur in identification with the ego, they will appear as drives to lust or power. This corresponds to Freud's description of the id. Only when the ego has separated itself sufficiently from the self are lust and power transformed in their manifestations and experienced as suprapersonal, archetypal dynamisms. Although Freudian therapy rightly applies a reductive analytical approach to ego-self identity (the id), it often proves sterile or destructive because it has no conception of the ego-self axis and its vital needs. Jungians, on the other hand, have instinctively honoured the ego-self axis without having a clear concept about it.

I appreciate Mrs. Jacoby's elaboration of the archetypal background of the theory of ego-self identity. All meaningful mental constructs must rest on an archetypal foundation which certainly does not invalidate them. Although Plato's visions when projected onto the heavens did not constitute an accurate empirical astronomy, they are still valid data for empirical psychology. The statement that my hypothesis is invalid because of its "state of perfection" which allows "no free discussion" seems a quaint complaint when applied to a theory which attempts to order and explain empirical data. If there are data which do not fit the theory, they should be presented. The fact that the first "uroboric" phase cannot be experienced does not invalidate the hypothesis. It is an inference derived from extrapolation, so to speak, and does not affect our practical functioning as therapists.

Several other points should be mentioned briefly. It is totally incorrect to say that my paper reveals a "misconception of the identity of ontogeny and phylogeny". This subject was not even mentioned. Mrs. Jacoby quoted my statement that I would attempt "to give equal consideration . . . to the phylogenetic, archetypal, timeless determinants on the one hand, and, on the other, the ontogenetic, individual factors deriving from one's personal life history". Even a casual reader would not misinterpret this as suggesting that ontogeny recapitulates phylogeny. It says only that there are both personal and archetypal factors in the individual psyche which merit attention.

There are other misunderstandings for which I must take some responsibility since I attempted to present too much in a brief paper. Although Mrs. Jacoby says I supplied no evidence for the statement that ego-self identity occurs regularly in the analysis of all individuals, that evidence was certainly implied in my list of the manifestations of ego-self identity. Has any analyst ever had a patient in whom was found no trace of either the power motive, the victim role, or a tendency to the provisional life? On another point, Mrs. Jacoby quotes me as saying that the central archetype "subordinates all other archetypal dominants to it" in spite of my stating earlier that "in the unconscious there is no separation of different things". She then asks "so how can one dominate another?" Those two apparently contradictory statements were made from different standpoints. Contents of the unconscious, to the extent that they are unconscious, are not separated because separation and discrimination is a specific function of consciousness. On the other hand, as we explore the unconscious we begin to make distinctions and to give different names to the various elements we encounter there. This discriminating process is an essential part of the meeting of the conscious with the unconscious. After this has been accomplished, at least to some degree, it is legitimate to consider the relative importance of the entities encountered. This is the basis for the statement that the central archetype "subordinates all other archetypal dominants to it". I offered no evidence for this statement but it seems a necessary postulate if an integrated personality is considered possible.

In conclusion, I can only assure Mrs. Jacoby that I do not "officiate as the

circle of totality" or fail to "search for appropriate modes of accepting . . . patients as individuals". The fact is, however, that psychotherapists are exposed to powerful projections which, in my opinion, often carry some aspect of the self. This gives our statements and attitudes to the patient a numinous impact that may carry the authority of the self. We don't choose this state of affairs. It is an unavoidable part of our daily work. To be thoroughly conscious of this fact and not to misuse the projected value and authority are prerequisites of a competent psychotherapist.

Copyright of Journal of Analytical Psychology is the property of Blackwell Publishing Limited and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.